



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE FORE-COURT OF WOMEN AND THE BRASS GATE IN THE TEMPLE OF JERUSALEM.

THERE are three entirely independent narratives regarding King Herod's temple, its plan, and the way that its single buildings were located and arranged. Two of them we find in Josephus (*Bellum*, V, 5, 1-6, and *Antiquit.*, XV, 11, 3-5) and the third in the *Mishna Middoth*. To these may be added a few supplementary, if casual observations, which are made in the same sources. The description given in *Antiquit.*, XV, 11, and linked with the history of Herod, treats in a somewhat concise form of the course of the structure itself, but it relates, rather emphatically and in full details, the expenditure of labour and money necessitated by the difficulties which were met with both in levelling and enlarging the surface of the hill on which the temple stood, and in erecting the porches which surrounded the sanctuary; the single parts of the temple are only mentioned by the way. In order to realize the value of this important description we must enter at once upon its sources and composition. We know that the fifteenth book of the *Antiquitates*, as well as the whole history of Herod, refer in both works of Josephus to Nicolaus of Damascus¹. The corresponding account in *Bellum*, I, 21, 1, contains, on the whole, the following information in but three lines: "Herod built the temple anew and enlarged the space around it, so that it was twice as large as

¹ See Destinton, *Die Quellen des Josephus*, pp. 102 ff.; Wachsmuth, *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte*, p. 445; Büchler, *J. Q. R.*, IX, 328.

before; the expenditure was immense and its splendour unsurpassed, as is witnessed by the large porches around the sanctuary, . . . which he built from the very foundation." The information, contained herein, agrees with the detailed account of the *Antiquitates*, and the few facts given prove that both narratives are derived from a common source¹. A comparison of both, however, raises the suspicion that the remaining explanations in the description of the *Antiquitates*, especially those referring to the works of King Solomon in XV, 11, 3, and to the vestment of the high-priest in XV, 11, 4, which are not even mentioned in *Bellum*, are not taken from Nicolaus of Damascus, but that they belong to another, viz. a Jewish source. That they are indeed foreign parts of the story is evident from the use of the first person of the verb in the otherwise impersonal description²; further from the fact that events are spoken of which happened in the year 44³ under the Emperor Claudius, and in 66 under Nero⁴, many years after the death of Nicolaus, and also from the remark at the conclusion, ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους τῶν συμβεβηκότων, it appears that that part which refers to the vestment of the high-priest must have been interpolated.

If a characteristic distinguishing quality is once detected in the foreign parts, it will not be difficult to thoroughly separate them; we are aided in this by an important observation. A careful examination of the whole section in *Antiquit.*, XV, 11, shows that the northern site of the mount of the temple is described in a single sentence (11, 4), the west site in a few lines (11, 5), and the south site with its magnificent porches is there given as the fourth, in a full and especially detailed account (11, 4). We miss, however, the description of the east site, which must have

¹ Cf. Schürer, *Geschichte*, I, 301, n. 12.

² In XV, 11, § 391 (ed. Niese), the reading is "We resolved to raise the walls of the temple in Nero's time;" § 398, "Our first King Solomon;" and in 11, 5, "Through which door, when we are clean," &c.

³ *Antiquit.*, XVIII, 4, 3; XX, 1, 1, 2.

⁴ *Wars*, V, 1, 5.

been, undoubtedly, mentioned in the first place in 11, 3, as is evident from the order in which the sites are named. And, indeed, we find at the end of this paragraph the information *κατὰ μὲν ἑφ' αὐτῶν ῥάχων ἰσομήκη τῷ τείχει στοὰν ἔχον διπλῆν, ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ νεῶ τετυχηκότος ἀφορώσαν εἰς τὰς θύρας αὐτοῦ*. But in the immediately preceding sentence the building of Solomon is described, and there is nothing in it which points to the works of King Herod, for he is not mentioned till several lines below. We can, therefore, hardly look for the missing part of the description of Nicolaus in the sentence we have quoted above. And there is another circumstance which most decidedly controverts the opinion, that it may belong to Nicolaus. The description of the north, west, and south deals exclusively with the walls at the border of the mount of the temple and with the porches connected with them; the east site of the temple mount is therefore omitted, while Josephus speaks here of the porch opposite the temple house. Now it is true that Nicolaus also discourses in XV, 11, 3, on the *ναός*, the temple house, its walls, doors, and decorations, part by part, and he, too, mentions (§ 396) *περιελάμβανεν δὲ καὶ στοαῖς μεγίσταις τὸν ναὸν ἅπαντα πρὸς τὴν ἀναλογίαν ἐπιτηδεύων καὶ τὰς δαπάνας τῶν πρὶν ὑπερβαλλόμενος, ὥς οὐκ ἄλλος τις δοκεῖ ἐπικεκκοσμηκέναι τὸν ναόν*, that Herod surrounded the temple house with most magnificent porches. But Nicolaus speaks clearly of porches, which adorned the sanctuary on all four sides, while in the sentence of Josephus quoted above but a single porch on the east site of the sanctuary is mentioned. This sentence can, therefore, not have been taken from Nicolaus. Moreover, we are informed in *Antiquit.*, XX, 9, 7, and *Bellum*, V, 5, 1, that King Solomon erected a porch on one, viz. the eastern site of the sanctuary. And because of this analogous statement we may designate the information of Josephus about the single porch expressly placed by him in the east, as belonging to the building of Solomon, and, therefore, as a component part of the Jewish source. But,

on the other hand, Nicolaus has spoken in *Antiquit.*, XV, 11, 3, of the porches of the sanctuary as well as of that on the east of the mount of the temple. The sentence which we miss must, therefore, have been placed immediately after the description of the magnificent porches around the ναός, which appears to be quite complete. Immediately after it we find, however, the words ἀμφω δ' ἦσαν μετὰ τοῦ τεύχους, and a short account of the wall erected under great difficulties without the two things, to which ἀμφω refers, being named. It seems—and this is also the interpretation of the Latin translator in the words, “porticus autem duae maximis parietibus fulciebantur”—as if the porch on the eastern site had been spoken of before, after the porches which surrounded the temple house had been expressly enumerated. Herewith the eastern site was described. This was followed in Nicolaus by the description of the northern site, such as we still find it with corresponding brevity in *Antiquit.*, XV, 11, 4. Josephus, however, interpolated between both his account of the buildings of Solomon, and thus put out of place the brief statement of Nicolaus about the east side of the temple mount¹.

The second account of the sanctuary in *Bellum*, V, 5, 1–6, belongs to Josephus, and contains a detailed description of the whole temple mount as it looked at the time of the author, and was known to him from personal observation. And the *Mishna Middoth*, which is our third source, describes also the whole sanctuary, as it appeared in the last decades before the destruction².

It may be taken for granted that within the period intervening between the consecration of the temple under

¹ The colonnade built by Solomon is also mentioned by Eupolemos (in Eusebius, *Prep. Evang.*, IX, 34, 450 d), but he locates it in the north of the temple. Cf. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, II, p. 118. The source of Josephus for his account of Solomon's temple is still unknown; it is perhaps Hellenistic.

² Cf. my article in the Chwolson *Jubelschrift*, ch. i.

Herod in the year 12-11 B.C. and the year 67, when the struggle in Judaea began, many an alteration, however slight, took place, and that more especially many a structure was added to the sanctuary. This fact is expressly established in Josephus. For in *Antiquit.*, XX, 9, 7, he states that the temple, though consecrated by King Herod, was not finished before about 64 under Agrippa II. It follows that many buildings must have been added and completed in the meantime. That these were not, at least in the last mentioned year of the building, insignificant improvements and unimportant alterations is evident from the statement of Josephus, which may be exaggerated but is still remarkable, that 18,000 workmen were out of employment when the sanctuary was completed. We must, of course, not expect the meagre account of our sources to contain detailed information about all the things and works which were done between the years 11 B.C. and 67 post Christum. But the more valuable must be the indirect explanations, though they insert but one or two links into the broken chain of the tradition of the temple structure, for they afford at the same time a contribution to Jewish history. We shall deal here with the (in themselves) meagre accounts of the so-called fore-court of women and the brass gate of the temple. But, nevertheless, they happen to be relatively more copious and fertile than the statements about other parts of the sanctuary, and they also give us an insight into the inner conditions of the Palestinian Judaism within the last decades of the existence of the temple.

I. THE FORE-COURT OF WOMEN.

(a) *Its Position.*

It is a generally accepted opinion—and we find it stated in every book which deals with this subject—that the fore-court of women was within the wall, which surrounded

the temple and its side buildings, and that it was separated from the adjoining fore-court of laymen by a partition. This view is almost exclusively based on the statements of Josephus, while but seldom reference is made to the Mishna, which is then said to be either unworthy of credit, where it contradicts Josephus, or to tell nothing new, where it agrees with him. We will, therefore, begin with the statements of Josephus, in order to show that the fore-court of women was on the outside of the encompassing wall. This is contrary to the opinion held hitherto.

Josephus speaks in four places of the space on the temple mount which women also were allowed to enter, and about the boundary beyond which they dared not go. He deals with this point in full details in *Contra Apionem*, II, 8, § 103, where he says: "Quattuor etenim habuit in circuitu porticus et harum singulae propriam secundum legem habuere custodiam. In exteriorem itaque ingredi licebat omnibus etiam alienigenis; mulieres tantummodo menstruatae transire prohibebantur. In secunda vero porticu cuncti Iudaei ingrediebantur eorumque coniuges, cum essent ab omni pollutione munda; in tertia masculi Iudaeorum mundi existentes atque purificati, in quartam autem sacerdotes stolis induti sacerdotalibus, in adytum vero soli principes sacerdotum propria stola circumamicti." The porticos mentioned here are not buildings, but, as is seen by the whole context, only the single parts of the temple mount, lying within each other like circles or rather like frames, as the temple mount itself and all vestibules formed quadrangles. We learn from other places in Josephus, that all the parts which are here enumerated were bounded within and without by walls and other enclosures. The first fore-court, which even heathens were allowed to enter, was surrounded on the outside in an enclosed square, by the high wall of the temple mount with its porches, and within by a partition built of stone. The third fore-court, viz. that of laymen, was bounded from without by the strong wall which surrounded the temple in the shape of a quad-

range, and from within by a low partition built of stone. Between these two fore-courts intervened the second, viz. that of women; it was bounded, therefore, from without by the partition of the heathens, and from within by the surrounding wall of the temple. Here, too, a fore-court encompassing the whole temple building, and not a space, occupying but one side of the temple mount, is spoken of. This is evident both from the whole enumeration and from the express information which Josephus has put at the head, viz. that the fore-courts were *in circuitu*, and is further corroborated by the observation, made by Josephus in *Bellum*, V, 5, 2 (§ 199), viz. that women were not allowed to enter by any of the seven gates of the second wall. The gates being in the north, east, and south, it is thus clearly indicated that the surrounding wall was the boundary of the space accessible to women. In *Bellum*, V, 5, 6, he also says: "Those suffering from uncleanness, and lepers, were forbidden to enter the town; women were forbidden to enter the sanctuary (= the temple mount) during their menstruation; but even when clean, they were not allowed to go beyond the boundary given above." We also find the same demarcation of the boundary lines of the temple mount in *Antiquit.*, XV, 11, 5, § 417. The first wall around the temple mount and the second around the temple are called there *περίβολος*, between both was the partition of stone, which was the boundary for the heathens, while the sanctuary within the second *περίβολος*, which had seven gates, was not accessible to women. Then follows the third *περίβολος*, which only the priests were allowed to enter. From all the passages quoted the conclusion may be drawn with certainty, that the second wall surrounding the temple was known to Josephus as the boundary of the space which women were allowed to enter. Hence, it immediately follows, that a building or a court, built on the temple mount for women to pray in, can only have stood on the outside of the seven gates of the second wall, viz. within the space, which was bounded on the one

side by the partition of the heathens, and on the other side by the second wall.

Now we learn from *Bellum*, V, 5, 2 (§ 198), that, in the east of the second wall, a special space was set aside for the worship of women. From what we have just stated it can only have been on the outside of the surrounding wall of the temple. But we also come to the same conclusion in the description which Josephus gives in connexion with the fore-court of women. Just as in the passages quoted above, he first describes the exterior wall of the temple mount with its porches, and then the grate built of stone, which was the boundary line to the heathens. He then states: "Fourteen steps led from the first to the second sanctuary, which was square, and surrounded by a special wall. After the fourteen steps, a plane of ten yards ran up to the wall, and from it other stairs of five steps led to the gates." Let us pause for a moment at this description, which shows, step by step, the space between the partition of heathens and the wall around the temple. As it only speaks of steps and a free space, it cannot mean the east side, where the fore-court of women was beside the stairs and the plane space. But Josephus is speaking here of the north and south sides of the temple mount. It is true he also describes in the same passage the eastern side, but every sentence clearly indicates that the observations which have reference to it are, so to speak, interpolated, and the description proper is interrupted by them. Thus, for instance, he states: "The stairs of five steps led up to the gates, of which there were four each in the north and south, and two in the east;" and what is here said about the relation of the steps to the gates cannot possibly refer to the two gates, as these had, on account of the fore-court of women, a particular position, which did not correspond with the rest; apart from this the two eastern gates were behind each other, whilst those in the north and south were next to each other. Josephus further informs us, that the fore-court of women had in the

north, east, and south, an entrance each for women ; they were not permitted to enter by the others, and even by their own they could not go beyond the fore-court. As the last words can only refer to the eastern gate of the second wall, to which steps led from the fore-court of women, the six gates of the surrounding wall, situated in the north and south and called "*other*," are evidently meant here ; we also see that the eastern side had to be specially dealt with. But it is evident from the whole description of the fore-court of women in Josephus, that it is considered as an entirely separate space, standing by itself, and having nothing in common with the space surrounded by the second wall, as women were not allowed to enter it. Moreover, as they were forbidden to enter by the eastern gate, as well as by the northern and southern gates, it also follows that the space occupied by the fore-court of women must also have been situated on the outside of the wall, just as the adjoining space in the north and south. The statement of Josephus, that the surrounding wall of the temple had four gates each in the north and south, is somewhat misleading, and produces the impression as if they were, within a single wall, next to each other ; but the gates of the fore-court of women were, in reality, lower than those of the surrounding wall by fifteen steps, or about seven and a half yards. In reading, however, soon afterwards in Josephus that there were in the east two gates, which were undoubtedly separated from each other by a considerable distance, and standing within two walls behind each other, one clearly sees that it was his intention to deal, in his description, at once with all the things that were on the same side. He therefore mentioned the side gates of the fore-court of women together with those of the second wall in the north and south, as well as in the east, although they had nothing in common, except that they were situated in the same direction. It is superfluous to call to mind the statement in *Antiquit.*, XV, 11, 5, where only seven gates of the second wall are

spoken of. But every attempt to give another interpretation¹ to this simple and unmistakable information, viz. εἶχεν δ' ὁ μὲν ἐντὸς περιβόλος κατὰ μὲν τὸ νότιον καὶ βόρειον κλίμα τριστοίχους πυλῶνας ἀλλήλων διεστῶτας, κατὰ δὲ ἡλίου βοῶνς ἕνα τὸν μέγαν, must fail because of the context. To make our conclusion quite certain, we may further point out that the eastern gate is here called "the great," and this is also done twice in *Bellum*, V, 5, 3, where it is expressly described as the east gate of the fore-court of laymen. From this, too, we may take it as a fact that the fore-court of women stood in the east outside the second wall.

But how does the Mishna stand in relation to this result? The Mishna, too, knows, like the above-quoted passage of Josephus, but seven gates within the surrounding wall of the temple (*Middoth*, I, 4). It speaks nowhere of the fore-court of women as a space connected with the fore-court of laymen by a common wall, but rather treats it as an entirely separate part of the temple mount, which was still further differentiated by the sacred injunctions. In this regard, *Kelim*, I, 8, is especially instructive. Here, as in Josephus, the single fore-courts are dealt with, and we are informed who was allowed to enter them and who not. The Mishna says:—

הר הבית מקודש ממנו שאין זבים חבות נדות ויולדות נכנסים לשם •
החיל מקודש ממנו שאין עובר גלולים וטמא מת נכנסים לשם • עזרת
נשים מקודשת ממנו שאין טבול יום נכנס לשם ואין חייבין עליה חטאת •
עזרת ישראל מקודשת ממנה שאין מחוסר כפורים נכנס לשם וחייבין עליה
חטאת • עזרת הכהנים מקודשת ממנה שאין ישראל נכנסים לשם אלא
בשעת צרכיהם לסמיכה ולשחיטה ולתנופה • בין האולם ולמזבח מקודש
ממנה שאין בעלי מומין ופרועי ראש נכנסים לשם • ההיכל מקודש ממנו
שאין נכנס לשם שלא רחוק ידים ורגלים • קדש הקדשים מקודש מהם
שאין נכנס לשם אלא כהן גדול ביום הכפורים בשעת העבודה :

¹ Comp. Spiess, *Das Jerusalem des Josephus*, p. 74, and Schick, *Die Stiftshütte* (Berlin, 1896), pp. 127 ff.

The three last portions of this sentence mention after the fore-court of the priests the space between the altar and the vestibule of the temple house, then the temple house, and lastly the holy of holies. This order shows that the account of the Mishna goes from east to west. That this is the case not only in the last three portions, but also in the enumeration of the fore-courts, is evident from the fore-court of women being mentioned, which, as we know, was in the east. The same order in dealing with the temple mount is also observed in *Mishna Middoth*, II, 1-5, where all the fore-courts are also described, and also in other places¹. This is of importance, if we compare the description of Josephus who, as we have seen, deals with the north and south sides of the temple mount, with the Mishna, which only speaks of its eastern part. Thus we learn in *Middoth*, II, 3, that, while twelve steps lead from the partition of the heathens to the fore-court of women, a plane space of ten yards is reached by ascending fourteen steps, and hence other steps lead to the gates of the second wall. This statement has been considered to contain a contradiction, and very different explanations have been tried to remove it². But there is, in reality, absolutely no contradiction at all; for one reaches, indeed, on the eastern site of the temple mount by twelve or fourteen steps the fore-court of women, and, by just as many on the northern and southern site, the plane space of ten yards of which Josephus speaks. The fore-court of women and this terrace were on the same level for the sake of symmetry, though the former was much larger. The eastern gate of the second wall was reached from the fore-court of women by fifteen steps, and just as many must have led from the terrace to the northern and corresponding southern gates. For it is a matter of course that the seven gates of the

¹ Comp. Tos. *Kelim*, I, 1, 12 and elsewhere; in the opposite direction, caused by the context of the Bible, runs the enumeration in the Baraita, *Joma*, 61 a, *Sifra*, p. 83 b.

² Vide J. Hildesheimer, *Die Beschreibung des Herodianischen Tempels*, and the opinions given there.

surrounding wall were on the same level. And, indeed, Josephus says, *ἐνθεν ἄλλοι πεντέβαθμοι κλίμακες ἀνῆγον*, that stairs of five steps each led from the terrace to the gates, and though he does not mention how many there were of them, still it follows from the use of the plural that there must have been two stairs at least; in fact, there were three stairs, viz. fifteen steps¹.

The Mishna speaks only casually of the outside of the second wall in the north and south, but deals more frequently with the cells built therein. Thus we read in *Middoth*, I, 7, that the cell enclosed in the northern side of the second surrounding wall, and called Beth-Hammôked, had two gates, one of which led into the interior space of the wall, the Azarah, the other into the exterior space, the Hêl. Thus the space which adjoins the exterior site is called Hêl. We learn the same also in *Middoth*, I, 5, where it is stated that the passage through the Nizôz gate, which was in the north side of the surrounding wall, communicated with the Hêl. On the other hand, we have seen in *Kelim*, I, 8, and *Middoth*, II, 3, that the space of ten yards, which came after the grate of the heathens, was also called Hêl, from which steps led to the fore-court of women in the east, and to the terrace in the north and south. Hence we know that the whole space between the grate of the heathens and the second wall was called Hêl, and that the fore-court of women, too, should properly be called by that name. This agrees with the fact that the fore-court of women was, strictly speaking, not more holy

¹ About the fifteen steps which led from the fore-court of women to the eastern gate of the surrounding wall Josephus states in *Bellum*, V, 5, 3, *τῶν γὰρ κατὰ τὰς ἄλλας πέντε βαθμῶν ἦσαν βραχύτεροι*. It has been generally accepted that there were but five steps on the northern and eastern sides. *Πεντε-βάθμων* would then have to be written in one word. Comp. Niese, *ib.* The fifteen steps on the eastern side do not seem to have formed a continuous stair, but as in the north and south they were interrupted by intervening spaces. For we are informed in the Mishna, *Sukka*, V, 4, that the priests, who on a public festival descended from the eastern gate of the second wall, stopped on the tenth step and sounded the trumpets.

which communicated with the eastern gate of the surrounding wall, were also there. In the four corners of the fore-court of women were, according to the Mishna (*Middoth*, II, 5), four chambers, each forty yards long, and it is also stated what they were for. In the south-eastern corner was the chamber of the Nazirites, where they cooked their peace-offerings at the expiration of their vow, and had their hair cut according to the injunction; in the north-east was the wood chamber, where priests, affected with bodily defects, prepared the fire-wood for the altar; in the north-western corner assembled those who, cured of leprosy, came into the sanctuary to offer their sacrifices of purification. What the chamber in the south-western corner was used for was not known to the otherwise well-informed R. Elieser ben Jacob, an authority on the tradition of the temple; but Abba Saul informs us that wine and oil were distributed there¹. We learn further from *Middoth*, II, 6, that there were chambers in the western wall of the fore-court of women, where the levitical singers kept all kinds of musical instruments. It may here be added that, according to the Mishna (*Middoth*, II, 2), the fore-court of women measured 135 yards square. Its width corresponded, therefore, with the whole width of the surrounding wall of the temple, which in *Middoth*, V, 2, is also said to be 135 yards. Josephus speaks only in an indefinite manner of the extent of the fore-court when he states that eleven thousand of the younger and stronger Jews, who were confined within the fore-court of women, died in the conquest of Jerusalem; he assigns to it, however, an extent which corresponds with that of the Mishna.

Three gates, as Josephus expressly states, led from the east, south, and north into the fore-court. It is remarkable that the Mishna, in which the fore-court is more minutely treated than in Josephus, does not mention them at all; evidently because there was no opportunity for speaking

¹ Comp. the same expression in *Middoth*, V, 3; and Tossafoth in *Menah.* 21 b, at the top.

of them. In the Mishna the three northern, the three southern, and one eastern gate in the surrounding wall of the temple are only enumerated and also named. But in another passage of the Mishna (*Middoth*, II, 6, and *Shekalim*, VI, 3) a greater number of the gates of the temple are given; it may therefore be supposed that, as in Josephus, the gates of the fore-court of women are here included. The text of the information, however, that is given in the name of Abba Jose ben Hanan, renders it questionable:—

שלשה עשרה שערים • שערים דרומיים סמוכים למערב (1) שער העליון •
 (2) שער הדלק • (3) שער הבכורות • (4) שער המים • ולעומתן סמוכין
 למערב (5) שער יכניה • (6) שער הקרבן • (7) שער הנשים • (8) שער
 השיר • (9) שבמורה שער נקנור • ושני פשפשין היו לו (10) אחד בימינו •
 (11) ואחד בשמאלו (12, 13) ושנים במערב לא היה להם שם.

Grätz¹ comments thereon: "This statement raises suspicion, for it seeks to make out, *per fas et nefas*, thirteen gates of the fore-court, in order to assimilate the thirteen genuflections in the temple to this very number; it therefore also enumerates as gates the two small doors next to the Nicanor gate, and supposes two other gates in the west of the fore-court, for which it gives neither space nor names. And just as there could not have been any gates in the west side, there was no gate of women and no gate of song on the north side." The objections, which Grätz presents, are too important to allow us to accept the account as reliable without any further consideration; but I do not think that we are, on that account, justified in ignoring a narrative which contains definite statements. For we see that the author, even where he, without any authority, counts small doors as gates, bases his statement on real facts. We must therefore not presume that he invented new gates, which did not in reality exist, in order to make up a certain number known to him *a priori*; but his enumeration

¹ *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, 1876, p. 442.

must be based on a tradition which differs from our Mishna (*Middoth*, I, 4). But let us ignore for the present the way in which the single gates were placed in the different directions and only consider their names. The fact becomes then at once conspicuous that nos. 2, 3, and 4 are also given in the Mishna in the same order as the southern gates of the surrounding wall; moreover, no. 6 is named there as one of the northern, and no. 9 as the eastern gate. As these five parts agree with the order of the temple gates, we are confirmed in our opinion that the enumeration is not without value, and hence we venture to surmise that the two missing northern gates must also be contained therein, though under different names. No. 1 שער העליון and no. 5 שער יכניה in the account of Abba Jose have no corresponding counterparts in the Mishna; on the other hand, the שער הניצוץ and שער בית המוקד in the latter are omitted in the former; it therefore does not appear forced, if we consider these gates identical. Then there remain nos. 7 and 8, the gate of women and that of song, and it is not difficult to recognize them as the two side gates of the fore-court of women, where, as we know from *Middoth*, II, 5, 6, and also partly from Josephus, the women and the Levitical singers were placed. If, however, the northern and southern gates of the fore-court of women are named in this enumeration, then there ought to be also mentioned therein its eastern gate, which is expressly named by Josephus. But no trace of it is to be found. The interpretation given above of the whole passage becomes therefore doubtful.

We have, however, to consider the established fact that the whole temple building had altogether thirteen gates; for there were in the surrounding wall three in the north, three in the south, and one in the east; in the fore-court of women one each on the same sides; in the vestibule of the temple, the temple and the sanctuary one each, leading from east to west. They thus formed a group of four northern, four southern, and five gates, leading from east to west; and

these, I believe, are meant in the enumeration of Abba Jose ben Ḥanan, which is confirmed in the case of nine out of thirteen. The whole combination can clearly be seen in the Mishna, which speaks of four southern, four northern, three eastern, and two western gates; the division of the five, leading from east to west, into two groups is to be ascribed to the Mishna. For we are told in *Shekalim*, VI, 2, that thirteen genuflections were made in the sanctuary: והיון היו משתחוים, ארבעה בצפון, וארבעה בדרום, שלש במזרח, ושתיים במערב; four in the north, four in the south, three in the east, and two in the west, corresponding to the gates. The teacher of the Mishna wanted to adapt the information of Abba Jose about the thirteen temple gates to these genuflections, but, not understanding that portion which refers to the gates leading from east to west, he thought the three eastern gates were the Nicanor gate with its two side doors, and he then added that the western gates had no names. It is possible, of course, that the three eastern gates of the fore-court of women, the fore-court of laymen, and of the vestibule, were designated as eastern, the two of the temple and the sanctuary as western even by Abba Jose, but that they were mistaken, as they were mentioned without names, for they had no names except the Nicanor gate. From this we learn, however, that the three gates of the fore-court of women were also known to the teacher of the Mishna, Abba Jose ben Ḥanan, and that he also gives the names of the northern and southern gates; these are not mentioned by Josephus, nor are the names of the seven gates of the surrounding wall.

As regards the names of the gates, about which the Mishna tells us more than Josephus, another information given in the Mishna, *Sukka*, V, 4, has to be considered¹. Here we have a detailed description of the position which the priests and Levites take up at the great festival of water-drawing, and how they move on in the procession:—

¹ For the different texts see Rabbinowicz about *Sukka*, 51 b.

ועמדו שני כהנים בשער העליון שיורד מעזרת ישראל לעזרת נשים ושתי חצוצרות בידיהן • קרא הנבר תקעו והריעו ותקעו • הגיעו למעלה העשירית תקעו והריעו ותקעו • הגיעו לעזרת נשים תקעו והריעו ותקעו • היו תוקעין והולכין עד שמגיעין לשער היוצא למזרח • הגיעו לשער היוצא למזרח הפכו פניהם למערב ואמרו אבותינו שהיו במקום הזה אחזריהם אל היכל יי ופניהם קדמה והמה משתחווים קדמה לשמש ואנו ליה וליה עינינו :

Here the eastern gate of the second surrounding wall, from which the stair leads into the fore-court of women, is designated as the upper gate, and another as the gate of the eastern exit; it can, however, not be ascertained whether the eastern gate of the fore-court of women or that of the surrounding wall of the temple mount is meant by it. We find in *Sukka*, V, 5, where the upper gate is mentioned again, שער התחתון a lower gate; this is in all probability identical with the formerly mentioned eastern exit, and its name indicates that in both cases the eastern gate of the fore-court of women is meant by it. It also follows from the description that its author either did not know or was not familiar with the appellation of the eastern gate of the second wall as given in *Middoth*, I, 4, viz. Nicanor gate; otherwise he would not have used¹ the long circumscription שער העליון היורד מעזרת ישראל לעזרת נשים. We find the latter appellation also in the description of the temple in Ezek. xl. 19 and ix. 2 (comp. 2 Kings xv. 35), where the

¹ The two passages in the Mishna, which differ in their designation of the eastern gate of the fore-court of women, hardly come from the same source. They differ, indeed, also in the number of trumpet sounds prescribed for the feast of tabernacles, which is already pointed out by the Talmud in *Sukka*, 51 b, as well as in the exact places where the trumpets had to be sounded. According to the first the trumpet should be blown in the upper gate, then on the tenth step of the stair which led into the fore-court of women, and at last in the fore-court of women; after that the blowing of the trumpet was continued uninterruptedly, until the priests arrived at the exit of the fore-court. But the second passage which gives the total number of trumpet sounds as prescribed for the feast of tabernacles, speaks only of a twice repeated blowing, viz. in the upper and lower gate. The same account also disagrees with *Sukka*, IV, 5, where trumpet sounds are also prescribed for the placing of the willow twigs on the altar, and these are not mentioned in *Sukka*, V, 5.

gate in the fore-court, that was situated on a higher level, is called the upper, and that in the lower fore-court of laymen the lower one. But by this designation only the situation of the gate was indicated, and not having become its proper name, it was possible that another of the seven gates in the surrounding wall of the temple was named likewise, and thus Abba Jose ben Ḥanan (*Middoth*, II, 6) could speak of the most exterior gate in the north of the wall as the upper one. How it was that Josephus gives no names to the gates, though in *Bellum*, V, 4, two gates in the wall of the temple mount are named by him, cannot be even surmised, as there is nothing to go on. But the Mishna gives in *Middoth*, I, 3, the names for southern, western, and northern gates of the wall of the temple mount, but calls the eastern gates only שער המזרחי; hence it is but right to inquire what may be the reason of this fact. As the same is the case with the gates of the surrounding wall of the temple in *Sukka*, V, 4, 5, and also in the above-mentioned account of Abba Jose ben Ḥanan, and as in both narratives just the names of those gates which lead from the east to the west are not known, it can hardly be considered a matter of chance. Should the names perhaps be assigned to a later period, preceding the destruction of Jerusalem but by a short time, and is it to be assumed that not all were given at the same time? This could be the more easily supposed, as Josephus appears to know no gate on the east site of the wall of the temple mount¹, and the Mishna (*Para*, III, 6, *Middoth*, I, 3) too gives but the designation of it: שבו כהן גדול השורף את הפרה, that the high-priest, about to prepare the ash of purification, the red cow, and all persons who take part in this act of preparation, go through the gate on the olive mount.

¹ In *Antiquit.*, XV, 11, 5, and *Bellum*, II, 19, 5; see Spiess, *Das Jerusalem des Josephus*, p. 65.

(c) *What the Fore-court of Women was used for and how it originated.*

Neither of our two sources describes with sufficient clearness of definition what the fore-court of women was for. It is true, Josephus says: "In the east there was a separate enclosure for women to worship, which was open to native and foreign Jewish women for religious services;" but it is not clear whether women only or if, on certain occasions, men too were allowed to enter here. To the latter, other places within the surrounding wall of the temple were open, while women were confined to the fore-court assigned to them¹. The Mishna, however, which speaks expressly of four chambers in the four corners of the fore-court of women, viz. for the Nazirites, for those who, cured of leprosy offered sacrifices, and for priests who prepared the firewood for the altar, seems to indicate that this space belonged to women but was used for general

¹ In *Antiquit.*, XV, 11, 5, as we have mentioned in the Introduction, p. 679, Josephus says: "In the east the second wall had a gate, the great one by which we entered when clean with the women; within it women were forbidden to enter the sanctuary." The obvious contradiction and the difficulty that women should be allowed to enter the eastern gate of the fore-court of laymen, which he otherwise declares to be prohibited (see above, p. 684), has been explained in various ways. Thus Spiess (p. 74 ff.) endeavours to get over it by an interpolation, which is neither supported by the context nor testified by the text; for he reads, "a gate, the great one, *τούτου δὲ ἀντικρὺν ἄλλον*." We have already mentioned above on p. 679, that the sentence, which speaks in the first person of the Jews is taken from Josephus, who thought that the description which is derived from Nicolaus of Damascus, speaks of the eastern gate in the fore-court of women, while, in reality, the fore-court of laymen is meant. This is undoubtedly clear from the following sentence, which is again taken from Nicolaus—*ἐκείνου δ' ἐνδοτέρῳ τρίτον, ὅπου τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν εἰσελθεῖν ἐξόν ἦν μόνοις*—here only the fore-court of priests can be meant, and *ἐκείνου* can only refer to the fore-court of laymen. The Baraita also states expressly in *Kiddushin*, 52 b, that women were not allowed to enter the fore-court of laymen. The explanation of Tossafoth is artificial.

purposes of the temple¹. Only on one occasion it was given up entirely to women, viz. at the feast of water-drawing; but even then, as the Mishna, *Sukka*, V, 2, relates, the fore-court was transformed for them, in order that they might watch from balconies the festive procession and the entertainments connected with it, separated from the men, who stood in the fore-court itself. For thus the Baraitha in *Sukka*, 51 b (*j. Sukka*, V, 55 b, *Tos. Sukka*, IV, 1), states: בראשונה היו נשים מבפנים ואנשים מבחוץ והיו באים לידי קלות ראש • התקינו שיהיו נשים יושבות מבחוץ ואנשים מבפנים • ועדיין היו באים לידי קלות ראש התקינו שיהיו נשים יושבות מלמעלה ואנשים מלמטה. "Originally the women stood within and the men outside, which made them frivolous; it was therefore ordained that they should change places; but when they continued being frivolous, it was ordained that women should stand above (on the balconies) and men below (in the fore-court)." During the whole year, however, the fore-court of women was used, as we have said already, by the Nazirites and others for preparatory functions. The name fore-court of women, in which the tradition of the Mishna and Josephus agree, appears therefore to originate from the fact that women were there on festivals, and this is very remarkable. But several things known to have been located in this space were only made for the feast of water-drawing, and this explains in some degree the fore-court receiving its appellation from the one occasion. Among these things were the balconies mentioned

¹ There were, according to a reliable witness, on the day on which the passover sacrifices were offered, and a larger crowd assembled on the temple mount, men too in the fore-court of women. For we are told in the Mishna, *Pessah.*, V, 10, that the first of the three groups where the passover sacrifices were offered betook themselves from the fore-court of laymen to the extremest fore-court of the temple mount, after having slaughtered the animal, sprinkled the blood, and burnt the fat; the second one went into the second fore-court, the *Hél*, and the third remained in the fore-court of laymen. But in the *Tos. Pessah.*, III, 12, we are informed by R. Elieser ben Jacob that the third group repaired to the fore-court of women.

from the one festival remained with the institutions during the whole year.

It is, however, very difficult to believe that a fore-court, whose single divisions were used throughout the year for definite purposes, should have retained its appellation from one occasion, unless women visited it also during the year. It has been considered a matter of course that women came frequently into this fore-court, but the remarkable fact has not been accounted for, that the four cells, the purpose of which the Mishna describes, had nothing to do with women. We have therefore to deal first with this question. One of the chambers was used by the Nazirites, who at the expiration of their vow had to have their hair cut and to offer sacrifices, according to the precept in Numbers vi, for both these functions. It seems very remarkable that a separate chamber should have been assigned to this purpose and, without doubt, arranged accordingly¹, whereas the appearance of the Nazirites must certainly be considered an extraordinary phenomenon and an exception. It is true Nazirites are mentioned in 1 Macc. iv. 49 at the time of the religious persecution under Antiochus IV Epiphanes; otherwise, however, they do not, as far as I know, appear anywhere during the whole period of the two following centuries. They turn up again in *Antiquit.*, XIX, 6, 1, where it is related Agrippa I ordered the hair of a large number of Nazirites to be cut, defraying, as is supposed, the expenses which their vow, to be fulfilled, required in the end². The Mishna, *Nazir*, III, 6, further

¹ See *Kelim*, VI, 2 הסלע שבירושלים שנגנז הסלע וכו'.

² I am inclined to believe that the fact which is communicated in a Baraitha in *j. Nazir*, V, 54 b; *Genes. Rab.*, 91, refers to Agrippa I: שלש מאות נזירים עלו בימי רבי שמעון בן שטח • מאה וחמשים מצא להם פתח ומאה וחמשים לא מצא להם פתח • אחא גבי ינאי מלכא אמר ליה אית הכא תלת מאה נזירין בעיין השע מאה קורבנן אלא יהי את פלגא מן דירך ואנא פלגא מן דירי • שלח ליה ארבע מאה וחמשים; firstly, because of the expenses of the sacrifices being defrayed in both cases by a king; secondly, because of the remarkably large number of Nazirites; and thirdly, because a similar thing has not happened before, as far as our sources go back. It cannot be denied, of course, that

relates that the Queen Helena of Adiabene, who was in Jerusalem between 44-48, was a Nazirite. Josephus (*Bellum*, II, 15, 1) tells us the same of Berenike, the sister of Agrippa II, who sojourned in Jerusalem in the year 64 in order to fulfil her vow. In his report about her, he says: "She stayed here in order to redeem a solemn promise made to God; for it was a custom for such as were afflicted by an illness or other misery to make vows, thirty days before offering their sacrifices, to abstain from wine and cut the hair of the head." From this statement, which speaks of an habitual practice, it may be conjectured that Berenike was not the only Nazirite of whose vow Josephus knew. The Tos. *Nazir*, IV, 10, also relates the same of a woman called Miriam of Palmyra, and the Mishna, *Nazir*, V, 5, too, tells us that Nazirites came from foreign countries to Jerusalem immediately after the temple had been destroyed. It cannot be a matter of chance that all the statements about Nazirites¹ which have come down to us, have reference to the period of the years 42 to 70, but it is rather due to the circumstance that there were many Nazirites about that time. Three of the five narra-

just as the religious persecution under Antiochus IV, the persecution of the Pharisees under Alexander Jannai may have produced a large number of Nazirites. According to the above interpretation the learned man, who is reported by the Aramaic portion of the narrative to have had intercourse with the king, is most likely to be Gamaliel I; for, as we learn in a Baraitha in *Pessah*., 88 b, a question regarding the passover offering is submitted to the latter by a king and a queen, and by these only Agrippa I and his wife Kypros can be meant. (In *Pessah*., 57 a, they are said to have further questioned the high-priest Issakhar of Kefar Barkai about a similar thing.) By Simon, as he is named in the narrative, the high-priest Ismael ben Fiabi might also be meant; for the latter is called in several places of Talmudical reports Simon the Just. He is reported in a Baraitha in *Nedarim*, 9 b (Tos. *Nazir*, V, 7; *j. Nazir*, I, 51 c; *Sifre Numeri*, § 22), to have said about himself, that he had never eaten of the sacrifice of a Nazir, except once. Hence there were at his time many Nazirites; then the king, whom he petitions, would be Agrippa II; for Ismael officiated between 59-61. See my article in Chwolson's *Jubelschrift*, ch. II.

¹ See *Acts of Apostles*, xxi, 23 ff., and the respective commentaries.

tives inform us that women made the vow of abstinence, while the two others do not exclude the possibility that the abstainers were also women. It must further be pointed out that it was a queen in one case, and in another the sister of the King Agrippa. Hence we may conclude, I think, that a great number of the Nazirites were women, and that the remarkable increase of this vow, within the three last decades of the existence of the temple, is to be ascribed to the fact that the Queen Helena had made such a vow and come to Jerusalem in order to fulfil it. Her example had, undoubtedly, prompted many women of Jerusalem and Judaea to become Nazirites, and it thus became necessary to designate and arrange a separate place both for the Queen Helena, who undoubtedly came to the temple, as she gave to it liberal presents, and for the women who were stimulated by her piety, to worship in. As women were not allowed to enter the surrounding wall of the temple, it was but natural that a place of worship was allotted to them outside this wall, viz. at the side which, on the one hand, allowed them to look into the temple proper and was directed towards the sanctuary, and where, on the other hand, male visitors went in the least. If we admit this consideration we may take it that the chamber for the Nazirites was established in the years after 42, when Agrippa I entered upon the regency and at the time of Queen Helena.

It must appear rather hazardous to draw from one single fact the inference as to the time of the origin of an institution, and especially if all the opinions in regard to it, which have prevailed hitherto, are thereby contradicted. Other documents must therefore be adduced. And indeed the same period which was determined above by the years 42 and 70 is also suggested in another statement in the Mishna, *Kerithoth*, I, 7, where we read : מעשה שעמרו קנים בירושלים בדנרי זהב • אמר רבן שמעון בן גמליאל המעון הזה לא אלן הלילה עד שיהיו בדנרין • נכנס לבית המדרש ולימד האשה שיש עליה חמש לידות ודאות חמש זיבות ודאות מביאה קרבן אחד ואוכלת מזבחים

ואין השאיר עליה חובה • ועמדו קנים בו ביום ברבעתים : once the price of pigeons had risen immensely in Jerusalem ; and Simon ben Gamaliel took an oath not to rest until they became cheaper ; he went into the house of learning and declared that a woman who under certain circumstances would have to offer five sacrifices, would do her duty with one offering ; consequently the price of pigeons was greatly reduced. It is clear from the whole narrative that the price had risen so high because there had been an unusually great demand for pigeons. This was caused, as is evident from the sentence of Simon ben Gamaliel, by the fact that many women whose duty it was to bring several offerings, had omitted to carry out this biblical precept and now wished to make good their neglect. It was but natural that with such a demand the pigeons required for their sacrifices became more expensive, and if women were not altogether to leave off, under these circumstances, to bring offerings, it was necessary to make this obligation more easy. In any case the report supposes, with unmistakable clearness, a sudden change to have occurred in regard to the religious duties of women, who were prompted thereby to fulfil the precept which they had neglected for many years¹. Though we know not exactly in which year this occurred, it must certainly be computed between the years 50 and 70, the time of Simon ben Gamaliel. We have thus again established the fact that women visited the temple in great numbers to sacrifice their pigeons, and hence we may conclude that the authorities of the temple took care that they had enough room on the temple mount. Again, as we are informed by the Mishna (*Sota*, I, 5), the eastern site on the outside of the surrounding wall of the temple was set apart as the place where women should assemble for their purification. The same is the case with those who, after having been freed from uncleanness, came

¹ The Mishna, *Shekalim*, VII, 7, also speaks of these sacrifices being facilitated : על הקנקן הסולות שיהיו באות משל צבור .

into the sanctuary to offer sacrifices ; to them the sentence of Simon ben Gamaliel also refers. They formed, together with those who, cured of leprosy, brought their sacrifices of purification into the temple, the category of those who had to be declared clean¹, and they stopped in the לשכת המצורעים, the fore-court of women. We therefore arrive at the conclusion that the chamber, where women sojourned who brought offerings after their confinement, was established at the time of Simon ben Gamaliel.

And other statements too tell us that women used to visit the sanctuary about that time, whereas I know of none previous to the year 42². In a Baraitha in *Hagiga*, 16 b (*Sifra*, 4 c), Rabbi Jose ben Halafta relates the following: "Abba Eleasar told me: We had once brought a young calf into the temple as a peace-offering and we drove it into the fore-court of women, who put their hands upon the victim, not because they were ordered to do so, but in order to please them." As Jose ben Halafta was not born before the year 80, Abba Eleasar, who is here said to have narrated the occurrence as one who witnessed and took part in it, must have lived in the last decades of the existence of the temple. In the Mishna, *Halla*, IV, 12, we learn that a priest, named Joseph, had also brought the female members of his family to Jerusalem for the supplementary passover offering ; but as the sages disapproved of it they had to leave. He can only have been prompted to do this by the spirit of the time, which also allowed women to take part in the sacrifices ; for, indeed, they seem to have been taken with him to the passover offering proper³. This is supposed to have been

¹ See *Tamid*, V, 6: וראש המעמד היה מעמיר את השמאים בשער המזרח, who are identical with those mentioned in *Sota*, I, 5: ששם משקין את החטאות ומטהרין את היולדות ומטהרין את המצורעים.

² It is true that the accounts of the Talmud about the time which precedes the year 42 are very meagre. See also *Aboth*, V, 5.

³ See the Mishna, *Pessah*., VIII, 1, and the Baraitha in *j. Kiddus*., I, 61 c: רבי יוסי אומר האשה עושה פסח הראשון לעצמה והשני מפילה לאחרים דברי רבי מאיר • רבי יוסי אומר האשה עושה פסח שני לעצמה אין צריך לומר הראשון • רבי אלעזר בי רבי שמעון

the rule, as the Baraitha in *Pessah.*, 89 a, tells us about their actual participation in the sacrifice: מעשה וקדמו בנות לבנים: ונמצא בנות זריות ובנים שפלים. In the same way the statement of the Baraitha in *Erubin*, 96 a (*j. Berakh.* II, 4c, *Mechilta* about *Exod.* xiii. 9, p. 21a): מיכל בת כושי היתה: מנחת תפלן ולא מיהו בה חכמים ואשתו של יונה היתה עולה לרגל ולא מיכל בת כושי, belongs, very likely, to this period, though we are not in a position to say anything more definite about the women here mentioned. We are here told of the pilgrimage of a woman to Jerusalem, though it is only mentioned as an exceptional case. But even if there were but few who had come for the festivals, nevertheless, room had to be found for them, and thus it was the fore-court of women, as is shown by the description of the feast of water-drawing, in which women assembled with their offerings. It follows from these considerations that not only the chamber of the Nazirites and that of those who had been cured of Levitical uncleanness, was established within the three last decades of the temple, but that the fore-court of women, too, which was in their immediate vicinity, or rather between them, originated within the same period; for there was no need for it as long as there were no female visitors in the temple. We have, moreover, to take into consideration the fact that not before the last decades, previous to the destruction of the temple, can the feast of water-drawing, which attracted the largest number of women on the temple mount, be shown to have regularly taken place along with popular festivities. As far as I know we have the description partly from Joshua ben Hananja, who was a young man in the year 70, partly from the teachers of the Mishna, who had witnessed it themselves and described it immediately after the destruction of the temple. Their description gives us the impression that they tell us about institutions and circumstances which have only taken place at their own

ני אומר האשה עושה פסח ראשון מפילה לאחרים ואינה עושה פסח שני. See also *j. Hilla*, IV, 60 b below, and *Tos. Pessah.*, VIII, 10.

time. This is confirmed by other acts¹. Moreover, the participation of Simon ben Gamaliel in the festivities is pointed out as very extraordinary, and it is he whose teachings during the years 50-70 also refer to other institutions of the fore-court of women². Finally we may add that the Queen Helena, whose presence in Jerusalem may have caused the establishment of one of the chambers in the fore-court of women, sojourned there also during the feast of tabernacles (Tos. *Sukka*, I, 1; *j. Sukka*, I, 51 d; *b. Sukka*, 2 b), and that according to Josephus (*Bellum*, V, 5, 2) the fore-court of women was open both to native and foreign women; and thus our conjecture that the fore-court itself owes its origin to the appearance of Queen Helena in the sanctuary in the years 44-48 will be greatly strengthened³.

(d) *On the History of the Fore-courts.*

All the proofs which I have quoted above, and which are only based on indirect statements, signify nothing if it can

¹ See my article in Chwolson's *Jubelschrift*, ch. I.

² Tos. *Sukka*, IV, 4, 5; *j. Sukka*, V, 53 b; *b. Sukka*, 55 b. The feast of water-drawing may belong to a prior period, but the festivities and processions connected with it likely fall within the last decades before 70. In the passages we have quoted is also mentioned what Hillel said when he noticed various groups of the people participating in the feast of water-drawing with unequal zeal. Hence it might be concluded that the feast was already celebrated by the people at his time. But both the Tosifta and the corresponding passages speak of the statement of Hillel in the midst of their narrative about this festival, without expressly mentioning that his sentence has reference to this occasion; neither does the report as given in the Talmud of Jerusalem mention it. I am therefore inclined to believe that Hillel did not make the remark at the feast of water-drawing. The tradition in *b. Sukka*, 53 a, which gives in the same connexion another sentence of Hillel, which certainly has nothing to do with this festival, shows that my doubt is justified. There the statement appears to be a copy of the narrative about the participation of Simon ben Gamaliel in the festival.

³ Venetianer in *Magyar Zsidó Szemle*, 1895, p. 220, also believes that the fore-court of women came into existence at a later period; but he computes it about the time of the temple building by Herod.

be shown that the fore-court of women or one of its buildings already existed in the temple built by Herod, or even before in that of Zerubbabel. In order therefore to either support or weaken our conjecture about the date of the origin of the chambers of the fore-court of women, we must consider the different fore-courts of the sanctuary. We may at once take it for granted that King Herod founded the new temple after the model of the former one, but on a larger scale and with greater splendour; and that, because of the state of public feeling against him, he took the greatest care to introduce no innovation beyond the expansion of the building space, the fore-courts, the surrounding walls and the single buildings, and the enlargement and addition of gates. The people would have looked upon any alteration in the plan itself as a contempt of what was old and long established. If we therefore knew the sanctuary of Zerubbabel, we might draw from it the conclusion as to a similar plan and arrangement of the corresponding parts in that of Herod, and we might be justified to conclude from the latter to the former. However, the former is not known to us, even in its outlines; for the Book of Ezra, which contains the history of the temple, does not devote a line to details, and Josephus too only reproduces the meagre account of Ezra vi. Only in the Books of Chronicles, which introduce in their descriptions of the time of the kings the circumstances of the fourth century before Christ, occasionally a few details about the second temple are given. Thus in the description of the temple of Solomon in 2 Chron. iv. 9 it is related above all: ויעש חצר הכהנים והעזרה הגדולה ודלתות; לעזרה ודלתותיהם צפה נחשת; Solomon built the court of priests and the large fore-court with copper-plated doors¹. Here, as elsewhere, the book speaks of two fore-courts, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 5; 2 Kings xxi. 5: "בשתי חצרות בית", and, in the plural form without any further remark, in 1 Chron. xxix. 12: "לחצרות בית" ולכל הלשכות סביב בית האלהים ולאוצרות הקדשים.

¹ See Stade in *Z. A. T. W.*, 1883, p. 152.

also 1 Chron. xxiii. 28, xxviii. 6 ; 2 Chron. xxiii. 5 ; Nehem. viii. 16, xiii. 7, and Ps. lxxv. 5, lxxxiv. 11, xcii. 14, xevi. 8, c. 4, cxvi. 19, cxxxv. 2 ; most of these undoubtedly refer to the second temple. It is also evident from 1 Macc. iv. 38 that there were two fore-courts : " And they saw the sanctuary desolated, and the altar desecrated, and the gates destroyed by fire, and the fore-courts covered with bushes as in a forest or on a mountain, and the chambers destroyed." Here "fore-courts" is used in the plural form. As the author only refers to those buildings, places, and things which were in the temple of Herod within the surrounding wall, we may conclude that he also, in speaking of fore-courts, only refers to the two which were known in the sanctuary of Zerubbabel and Herod, and which were also located within the wall. The description of the rebuilding of the temple which then follows in 1 Macc. iv. 48 confirms this opinion. Here also the single parts of the sanctuary are enumerated, among them fore-courts in the plural, and here again the description only contains what was situated within the wall of the fore-court of laymen. This proves that only these fore-courts were in existence. If we compare it with the express statements in 2 Chron. iv. 9 and the numerous observations which we find in Josephus and the Mishna, we are justified in maintaining that the fore-court of the priests and that of laymen is meant by them. Our opinion is further corroborated by 1 Macc. ix. 54, where it is stated : Alkimos orders to pull down τὸ τεῖχος τῆς αὐλῆς τῶν ἀγίων τῆς ἐσωτέρας καὶ καθεῖλε τὰ ἔργα τῶν προφητῶν καὶ ἐνήρξατο καθαιρεῖν¹. Τὰ ἅγια means, accord-

¹ The first sentence speaks of the actual pulling down of the works of the prophets, while the second only relates that Alkimos began to pull them down. It is manifest that both statements cannot be maintained next to each other. And there is no basis for the explanation which Grimm gives in reference to this passage, viz. that in one part of the wall the order of Alkimos was actually carried out, but in the other it was only begun. Neither is the explanation which Keil gives in justification of the last sentence more clear. But it rather seems to be a sentence added by a writer who would not admit that the order

ing to 1 Macc. iv. 48, the temple house itself, just as *ἀγίασμα* in iv. 38, where it is said to have been built; Ἡ αὐλὴ τῶν ἁγίων means, therefore, the fore-court of the temple house to which, as there were several fore-courts, is added ἡ ἑσωτέρα, viz. that the fore-court adjoining the temple house, that is the fore-court of priests, is meant thereby. Thus Alkimos orders the wall which surrounded this fore-court to be pulled down¹.

We find the same appellation for this fore-court, and also the division of the fore-courts into two parts, in the vision of Ezekiel about the future temple; for in xlv. 17: והיה בבואם אל שערי החצר הפנימית בגדי פשתים ילבושו ולא יעלה עליהם צמר בשרתם בשערי החצר הפנימית וביתה ובצאתם אל החצר החיצונה אל העם יפשטו את בגדיהם אשר המה משרתים בם והניחו אותם בלשכות הקדש ולא יקדשו את העם בבגדיהם; and in xlv. 19: ובצאתם אל החצר החיצונה אל העם יפשטו את בגדיהם אשר המה משרתים בם והניחו אותם בלשכות הקדש ולא יקדשו את העם בבגדיהם; we find expressly mentioned next to each other, the inner fore-court as the office of the priests, and the exterior one as the place where the people sojourned during the sacrificial service. We have further to bear in mind that in LXX in Ezek. xlv. 18 the inner fore-court is called ἡ αὐλὴ ἡ ἑσωτέρα, viz. by exactly the same words as in 1 Macc. ix. 54. It is also called in Ezek. xlii. 13, 14, xlv. 19, 20 קדש, and surrounded by a wall, which can only have been a low one, as it is called גדר in xlii. 7, 10, 12. It is this wall which Alkimos ordered to be pulled down, as it formed a barrier between the priests and the people, and he desired, in all probability, that the latter should be nearer the altar and the sacrificial service. It is not stated that this wall was again put up, and the people certainly

had been actually carried out, and he also interpolated interruptingly in verse 55 between the two punishments which Alkimos suffered: καὶ ἐνεποδίσθη τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

¹ That is also the explanation of Keil in reference to this passage, p. 162. The objections raised by Schürer, *Geschichte*, I, p. 176, note 5, cannot be persuasive against the simple text. He identifies ἡ αὐλὴ ἡ ἑσωτέρα with the designation given only by Josephus to the second surrounding wall of the temple, ἡ ἔνδον αὐλή, which is certainly without any foundation.

wished to be allowed to enter further. The barrier did therefore not exist for a long time, and was only built by King Alexander Jannai. This Josephus states in *Antiquit.*, XIII, 13, 5: δρύφακτον δὲ ξύλινον περὶ τὸν βωμὸν καὶ τὸν ναὸν βαλλόμενος μεχρὶ τοῦ θριγκοῦ, εἰς ὃν μόνοις ἐξῆν ἱερεῦσιν εἰσιέναι. It was a wooden one, but Herod built one of stone (*Bellum*, V, 5, 6). That it is identical with the one built by Alexander is also proved by the description given here: περιέστεφε δὲ τὸν τε ναὸν καὶ τὸν βωμὸν εὐλιθόν τι καὶ χαλρὲν γείσιον ὅσον πηχναῖον ὕψος, ὃ διεῖργεν ἐξωτέρῳ τὸν δῆμον ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερέων. These details show us at the same time that the temple of Zerubbabel was like the one sketched out by Ezekiel in those points into which we have inquired, simply because they both took as a model the building which existed before the exile¹. From the fact that no mention whatever of a fore-court of women in the sanctuary is made by Ezekiel in the course of his detailed description of every particular, we may conclude that there was no fore-court for women in the temple of Zerubbabel, nor, in all probability, in that of Herod².

In dealing with this question the description of the temple of Solomon which we find in Josephus (*Antiquit.*, VIII, 3, 9) deserves our notice. For it contains among other things the following: "On the outside of the wall of the fore-court of priests (which he describes almost with the same words as those built by Alexander Jannai and Herod, περιέβαλε δὲ τοῦ ναοῦ κύκλῳ γείσιον εἰς τρεῖς πῆχεις ἀναγαγὼν τὸ ὕψος, εἰρξοντα μὲν τοὺς πολλοὺς τῆς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν εἰσόδου, μόνοις δὲ ἀνειμένην αὐτὴν τοῖς ἱερεῦσι σηματοῦντα) Solomon built a sanctuary in the form of a quadrangle, erecting large and wide halls and opening high gates, each of which was directed towards one of the cardinal

¹ See Smend, *Ezekiel*, p. 317, and Cornill, *Ezekiel*, p. 453.

² The Mishna, *Middoth*, II, 5, recognizes, indeed, the four chambers of the fore-court of women in those described by Ezekiel in xlvi. 21; but if we consider the position and designation of the chambers as given here, we shall see that they differ from those of the fore-court. See also Kamchi in reference to this passage.

points of the world, and closed by golden doors. All of the people entered this sanctuary, around which was the third sanctuary, which was surrounded by double halls." If we consider the plan and form of the fore-court, as described here, we shall soon see that they exactly agree with Ezek. xl. 47. It also contains the number and position of the gates as given in Ezek. xl. 20-31, and the porches along the wall of the fore-court¹ as given in Ezek. xlii. 6, which Josephus mentions as also belonging to the temple of Zerubbabel (*Antiquit.*, XI, 4, 7²), and consequently also to that of Herod (*Bellum*, V, 5, 2). Josephus further mentions, as we have already pointed out in the temple of Solomon, the low wall around the temple house and the altar which we found in Ezekiel, the First Book of Maccabees, and in connexion with the King Alexander Jannai. In all these details the accounts agree, and hence we may conclude that the description of the temple of Solomon may have been taken from the vision of Ezekiel, or rather the second temple of Zerubbabel, nay, perhaps—as might be inferred from the double halls being mentioned around the extreme fore-court, but does not seem probable, as only four gates are given—from that of

¹ Of this hall within the inner fore-court of the temple of Solomon, which Josephus also mentions in *Antiquit.*, XV, 11, 3, and *Bellum*, V, 5, 1, Eupolemos too speaks in Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, IX, 34, 250 c; but he places it on the northern site, while Josephus locates it in the east; comp. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, I, p. 118. But in *Antiquit.*, VIII, 3, 9, halls on all sides of the wall are ascribed to Salomo.

² For Josephus states: "The priests and Levites placed gate-keepers at each gate according to the Mosaic law, for the Jews had erected τὰς ἐν κύκλῳ τοῦ ναοῦ στοὰς τοῦ ἐνδοθεν ἱεροῦ." First of all it must be said that the three last words are a useless addition of Josephus himself to what he copied; it is conspicuous by the very expression which Josephus alone uses for the designation of the fore-court. We have also to consider that the connexion between the porches and the door-keepers is not clear, as these had their places outside the fore-court (*Middoth*, I, 1). But if we bear in mind the chambers which were formed by the porches (see Sulley, *The Temple of Ezekiel's prophecy*, pp. 26 and 31) and the doors of which went outside (*Middoth*, I, 5, 7) the account becomes partly intelligible.

Herod, and transferred to that of Solomon. But even here, though the fore-courts are clearly described, nothing is said which would point to the existence of a separate fore-court for women. For in none of the descriptions which we have hitherto examined are women even mentioned, and they are directly excluded by the statement in the description of the temple of Solomon, viz. that *all* of the people entered the second sanctuary; for women, as Josephus clearly points out in other places, were not allowed to enter this fore-court, and this was certainly also the case at the time before Herod. At the end of our inquiry into the development of the fore-courts we thus come to the conclusion that there was in the temple of Herod no separate fore-court for women to worship in. The one which is described by Josephus in *Bellum*, V, 5, 2, must therefore have come into existence in the time after Herod.

(e) *On the History of the Temple Gates.*

And still another inquiry, which we have to make entirely apart from this, is likely to confirm our proposition about the date of the origin of the fore-court of women. We have to deal with the question when the gates of the temple took the form in which they are described by Josephus in connexion with the fore-court of women. But it must be stated at once that other alterations also in the sanctuary took place in the time after Herod. For several accounts indicate that its gates underwent a great transformation long after King Herod had consecrated the temple. For Josephus tells us in *Bellum*, V, 5, 3, that nine of the ten gates which were in the inner fore-court were overlaid with gold and silver, and that these magnificent metal dressings were presented by the Alabarch Alexander, the father of the procurator of Judaea, Tiberius. Josephus does not state when this donation was given, but from other accounts, which he gives elsewhere of Alexander, we might draw a chronological conclusion. He relates in

Antiquit., XIX, 5, 1, that the Emperor Claudius, when he came on the throne, in the year 41, delivered Alexander from prison, to which he had been sent by Caligula. Grätz¹ points out that Alexander must have been in the year 20 already a grown-up man, as his son Marcus was betrothed by Agrippa I, who died in 44, to his (Agrippa's) daughter (*Antiquit.*, XIX, 5, 1), and Marcus must have been at that time at least twenty years old. It has to be added that the latter died soon after, and Agrippa I married his daughter to his brother Herod II; her betrothal to Marcus must therefore have taken place one or two years before. Moreover, as Alexander is mentioned by Josephus as an old friend of Claudius, and as the advocate of his mother, we shall be probably right in supposing that both were of the same age, and as Claudius was born in the year 10 B. C., Alexander must have been born about the same time. He was rich²; for he provided Agrippa, who later became king, when he journeyed to Rome in 36 without any means, with money (*Bellum*, V, 6, 3), and he was therefore in a position to give a large donation to the temple in Jerusalem. But when was this?

But even if we presume, as we have just stated, Alexander to have been born in the year 10, or, at the utmost, to have been seventy-one years old in the year 41, viz. to have been born in the year 30 before Christ, he cannot have given his donation of gold to the temple in Jerusalem for the building under Herod; for its building began in the year 20/19 before Christ, and its consecration took place³ in 12/11; hence Alexander was then a child. Neither the reign of Archelaus (4 before Christ till 6 after Christ), nor that of the Roman procurators (6-41), supplies an occasion on which the Alabarch of Alexandria may have been induced to have the gates of the inner fore-court

¹ *Monatsschrift*, 1876, p. 316.

² *Antiquit.*, XX, 5, 2: 'Αλαβαρχήσαντος ἐν Ἀλεξανδρεία γένει τε καὶ πλούτῳ πρωτεύσαντος τῶν ἐκεῖ καθ' αὐτόν.

³ *Antiquit.*, XV, 11, 5, 6. See Schürer, *Geschichte*, I, p. 301, note 12.

covered with gold. For the avarice of the procurators did not admit of such an idea. The age of Alexander, as well as the change of his fate when Claudius became emperor, and his relation to Agrippa I, who was appointed King of Judaea by the same Claudius, point to the year 41 as the most probable date for his large donation. For at that time he was delivered from prison, the Jews of Alexandria recovered their rights, and those of Palestine were relieved of the terrible oppression from which they were suffering under Caligula, and Alexander became related to Agrippa I by betrothal. The gilding of the temple gates may have been a thank-offering to God for the liberty which he had gained personally, as well as that of all the Jews. But how did the gates look up to that time? We are certain that Herod did not plate them with gold and silver at the time when he built the temple. This is evident both from what Josephus tells us about the gift of Alexander, and not less from the fact that Nicolaus of Damascus says nothing at all on the point. For he describes especially and rather exuberantly (*Antiquit.*, XV, 11, 5) the splendour and magnificence of the gates of the temple house, in order to glorify the king, and he would certainly not have omitted to relate the same of the gates of the wall of the fore-court if there had been an occasion to do so.

Let us assume that the account of Josephus, viz. that Alexander gilded nine out of the ten gates, is to be taken in a strictly literal sense. It then follows that Alexander only adorned the nine exterior gates of the surrounding wall and of the fore-court of women, but that he left unaltered the eastern gate of the surrounding wall, or that a tenth gate was not yet in existence, or that one of the ten, having been already overlaid with a precious coat by somebody else, the gilding by Alexander was rendered superfluous. The Mishna (*Middoth*, II, 3) states: כל השערים שהיו שם נשתנו להיות של זהב; חרץ חשערי נקנור מפני שנעשה בהם נס ויש אומרים מפני שנחושטין מצהיב; all gates of the temple were transformed into golden ones,

with the exception of the Nicanor gate, as a miracle had happened to it or, as others say, because its brass glittered like gold. In this statement the Nicanor gate is supposed to exist, viz. plated with brass, when the others were being gilded. But even this was not due to Herod, but was likewise a donation of a man named Nicanor, and not otherwise known; hence it may have come into existence between 12 and 11 before Christ, in the year when the temple was consecrated by Herod, and at the time when Alexander ordered the other gates to be gilded¹. In order to fix the time more definitely the same points have to be considered as were conclusive in regard to the donation of Alexander, with which we have dealt above. We may therefore suppose with good reason that the donation of Nicanor was prompted by the same feelings of gratitude for the regained religious and national liberty as that of Alexander, viz. that it was given after the year 41². And another circumstance favours this supposition. In the Mishna (*Joma*, III, 10) there is an account, which has by chance come down to us, about several donations dedicated to the temple in Jerusalem, amongst them about that of Nicanor. And this takes us to the same period as the former considerations. Here it is related of Queen Helena, עשתה נברשת של זהב על פתחו של היכל, ואף היא עשתה מבלא של זהב, שפרשת כוטה כתובה עליה, that she dedicated these ornamentations of gold to the sanctuary; of Monobaz, היה עושה כל יום הכפורים של זהב, that he had the handles of all the utensils which were used on the day of atonement

¹ Grätz, in *Monatsschrift*, 1881, p. 204, asserts that it was built at the time when Herod built the temple, and that Nicanor was Alabarch in Alexandria; but I can detect nothing that points to this.

² From the accounts of the Talmud about Nicanor it is evident that he resided in Palestine. For it is stated in *Joma*, 38 a, in a Baraitha: מה נסים נעשו לדלתותיו אמרו כשהלך נקטר להביא דלתות מאלכסנדריא של מצרים בחזירתו עמד עליו נחשול שבים. Here the verb כשהלך and the corresponding בחזירתו can only refer to one residing in Judaea. It is true that both expressions are omitted in *J. Joma*, III, 41 a, and *Tos. Joma*, III, 4, only gives כשהיה מביא, but this also indicates Palestine.

gilded; and of ben-Gamala, probably identical with the high-priest of the years 63-65¹, that he presented a golden urn, in which to cast lots of the two bucks on the day of atonement. Here a number of donations, given to the temple at the same time or within a short period, are placed together, and they show that then the liberality and magnanimity of the rich evinced itself in providing the sanctuary with vessels and ornamentations of gold. Within the same series we find the gift of Nicanor; it may therefore belong to the same period as that of Queen Helena, who was in Jerusalem between 44-48², and this is confirmed by the above considerations.

Now if the Alabarch Alexander, as Josephus informs us, plated nine gates of the fore-courts with gold, the fore-court of women, without which there were only seven, must needs then already have been in existence. This contradicts, however, the result which we got above, viz. that the establishment of the fore-court of women was due to the presence of Queen Helena in Jerusalem during the years 44-48. For we have assumed Alexander's donation to have been given soon after the year 41. But let us bear in mind that I only endeavoured to prove and define the limit of time within which Alexander may have made his gift, viz. not before the year 41, that on the other side the limit below is only drawn by the year 70 or by the year in which Alexander died, which is not known and was probably earlier than 70. Thus we have no difficulty in fixing the gilding of the gates, after the fore-court of women had been established, between 44 and 48. But it is also possible that Alexander only gilded the gates of the surrounding wall, of which alone the Mishna seems to speak, and that the fore-court of women did not yet exist, viz. between 41 and 44; when this fore-court was established soon afterwards its gates received the same decoration probably out

¹ *Antiquit.*, XX, 5, 2; 2, 5. See Grätz, *Geschichte*, III, p. 785; Schürer, I, p. 474, note 8.

² See Schürer, II, p. 171, note 559.

of the treasure of the temple¹, and Josephus, who had been told that the gates of the inner fore-court owed their gilding to Alexander, took the tradition to refer to all the gates which stood plated with gold at his time. I shall be told that nowhere can be found a trace of the great works in the temple which are here mentioned, and that the Mishna only speaks of small vessels in the sanctuary being transformed. But then I have to point out what Josephus states (*Antiquit.*, XX, 9, 7) that there were in the year 63/64, after the temple had been completed, 18,000 workmen without employment. Even if this large number be reduced to one tenth, it still follows that in the year named great works were carried out in the temple, in which several hundred men were employed. Josephus further states that the King Agrippa II had been requested to rebuild the eastern hall, which stood unaltered from the time of Solomon², and in all probability did not correspond with the splendour of those built by Herod. It follows from this too that Agrippa, to whom the Emperor Claudius had entrusted the superintendence of the sanctuary, had

¹ In *Bellum*, V, 5, 1, Josephus states that for the great works which were undertaken in order to enlarge the temple mount the whole holy treasure was used, which consisted of donations coming from every part of the world, and in *Antiquit.*, XX, 9, 7, he tells us that the treasure of the temple, which they would not preserve from fear of the Romans, was used for building out the temple. See also *j. Shekal.*, IV, 48 a.

² Josephus says: ἡ στοὰ τοῦ ἔξωθεν ἱεροῦ . . . ἔργον Σολομῶνος τοῦ βασιλέως πρῶτον, by which, according to his own proper designation (*Bellum*, IV, 5, 1; VI, 2, 7; 4, 4, 5; 5, 2; 6, 2), the porch on the border of the temple mount is meant. In *Bellum*, V, 5, 1, and *Antiquit.*, XV, 11, 3, only the eastern porch which was before the temple house is given by him as the work of Solomon, and absolutely nothing is said about any other; see above, p. 2 a. In *Antiquit.*, VIII, 3, 9, it is, indeed, stated that King Solomon erected porches also around the temple mount. But this description cannot be taken into our consideration, because here, halls around the whole temple as well as around the temple mount are ascribed to King Solomon; and this is contradicted by the definite statement in *Bellum*, V, 5, 1, and *Antiquit.*, XV, 11, 3, and can only refer to the second temple. It is manifest that here in *Antiquit.*, XX, 9, 7, the two porches are mistaken for each other. See also Spiess, *Das Jerusalem des Josephus*, p. 59, and the commentaries to *Johannes*, 10, 23.

occupied himself till then also with the buildings of the temple itself. This is also proved by the account (*Bellum*, V, 1, 5; *Antiquit.*, XV, 11, 3) that the people and the priests had decided to support the temple from below and to heighten it by twenty yards, and that Agrippa procured with great difficulty and costs timber from Lebanon for that purpose. We thus see that Agrippa II had much to do with temple building, and employed for this purpose a large number of working-men. This attention which he devoted to the sanctuary, and which made him undoubtedly popular, was closely connected with the superintendence of the temple committed to him by the emperor; hence the beginning of his buildings is to be fixed immediately after he had received the dignity. This in all probability happened in the year 50¹ and lasted up to the year 66, when he was interrupted in his enterprises by the revolution which broke out. About this time the fore-court of women may, amongst others, have been transformed, as is described in the Mishna and Baraitha, but the fore-court itself must have already existed for several years, viz. as we have shown above, since Queen Helena stayed in Jerusalem. In any case it is evident that many a building was erected on the mount of the sanctuary within the last decades before the destruction of the temple, and our conclusion that the fore-court of women also belonged to these buildings is hereby confirmed. We may add in conclusion that R. Eleasar ben Zadok (Tos. *Kelim*, 3, II, 2), who witnessed the proceedings in Jerusalem shortly before the year 70, speaks of large works on the temple mount in a sentence which deals with the Levitical precepts of purification. He says: כְּלוֹנֶסְאוֹת הָיוּ בְּהָר הַבַּיִת שֶׁעָלִיהֶן אֲוִמָּנִים יֹשְׁבִין ; “there were on the temple mount beams on which workmen were sitting polishing stones.” (See Tos. *Sabb.*, XIII, 2, and Grätz in *Monatsschrift*, 1877, p. 85 ff.)

ADOLF BÜCHLER.

¹ *Antiquit.*, XX, 5, 2; *Bellum*, II, 12, 1. See Schürer, I, p. 491, note 5.